UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2597th MEETING: 20 JUNE 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2597)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Complaint by Angola against South Africa:	
Letter dated 13 June 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17267) ...	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2597th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 20 June 1985, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. D. H. N. ALLEYNE
(Trinidad and Tobago).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2597)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. Complaint by Angola against South Africa:
   Letter dated 13 June 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17267)

The meeting was called to order at 4.35 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Complaint by Angola against South Africa:
Letter dated 13 June 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17267)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with a decision taken at the 2596th meeting, I invite the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Angola to take a place at the Council table and I invite the representatives of Argentina, the Bahamas, Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, Liberia, Pakistan, Sao Tome and Principe, South Africa, the Sudan, the United Republic of Tanzania and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. van Dunem (Angola), took a place at the Council table; Mr. Muñiz (Argentina), Mr. Hepburn (Bahamas), Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Schlegel (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Kofa (Liberia), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Branco (Sao Tome and Principe), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Birido (Sudan), Mr. Foum (United Republic of Tanzania) and Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of the Congo in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and under rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Gayama (Congo) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is the representative of the Bahamas, who wishes to make a statement in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States for the month of June. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

4. Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas): I happily uphold the tradition of the first-time speakers to pay tribute to you, Sir, and to commend you for the efficient manner in which you are fulfilling your duty as current President of the Council, and also to endorse the just compliments apportioned to your predecessor for his performance last month.

5. In my capacity as present Chairman of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, I take this opportunity to express on their behalf a sense of mortification at the prevailing situation in southern Africa, which continues to become increasingly grim because of the unrelenting malevolence of the racist régime in South Africa. Not only does the Pretoria régime flagrantly disregard the exhortations of the international community for flexibility and compromise, but it persists in violating the territorial integrity of neighbouring sovereign States in its determination to perpetuate the heinous system of *apartheid*.

6. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Angola, in his reports and his statement this morning [*2596th meeting*], outlined the events of 21 May 1985, when a group of South African commandos was apprehended within the borders of Angola. In effect, had this mission to sabotage an oil company in the province of Cabinda been successful, once again there would have been the recurrence of the senseless loss of innocent lives as well as a setback to the economic stability of the Angolan State as a whole. We in the region share the indignation and frustration that the Angolan Government and people must feel as a result of these unwarranted violations of their territorial integrity.

7. It is not the intention of the Member States of Latin America and the Caribbean to make any judgement on the

circumstances surrounding the message from the Angolan Government, the text of which is contained in document S/17246. Rather, it is to the nature of such acts of aggression that we voice our serious concern. We feel that unconstrained behaviour of this sort must not be tolerated by the international community because, in the final analysis, it is the peace and security of an integrated and interdependent planet that is threatened.

8. Further, it is also of utmost importance to recall that a short time ago both the Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa had given publicly what turned out to be lip service to the idea of participating in serious and positive negotiations with the aim of establishing a peaceful, fair and permanent solution to the problems in southern Africa. It is clear, although not surprising, none the less, that the words of the representatives of this perplexing racist régime are not in accord with its actions. This kind of duplicity does not and cannot enhance the peace and security of southern Africa or, for that matter, of the continent and the entire international community.

9. The most disturbing aspect of all these incidents is that the unique nature of the *apartheid* system prevails, and it is on that offensive and abhorrent system that the entire legal, political, economic and social structure of the Pretoria Government is based. Consequently, unless the Government of South Africa continues to hear statements of condemnation of its violation of human rights, territorial integrity and self-determination of peoples, it is probable that even greater atrocities would occur.

10. Finally, I wish to thank you, Mr. President, and the members of the Council for this invitation to speak, and I also wish to reiterate that the Member States of Latin America and the Caribbean condemn the insurgence of South African commandos into Angolan territory and consider comments about linkage and so on as excuses and delaying tactics. We further consider the acts as a calculated effort on the part of the Pretoria régime to bolster and maintain this evil system. In this regard, we express our determination not to stand idly by and allow our silence to be misconstrued. While we cannot claim to be privy to all of the facts, we know enough to deplore and condemn these actions as illegal and in direct contravention of the principles and Articles of the Charter of the United Nations.

11. It is along those lines that we register our opposition and recommend that the entire international community act accordingly.

12. Mr. LOUET (France) (*interpretation from French*): The international community is in duty bound to denounce the behaviour of a State that does not comply with the rules of international law and pursues a policy of force against its neighbours. I note with regret that this is yet again the case with South Africa. The States of southern Africa are the victims of its aggressive behaviour: Botswana, where last Friday South African commandos carried out a bloody operation, has brought to the Security Council a complaint that we shall be considering shortly [*S/17279*]. Today, it is the People's Republic of Angola that is denouncing yet another strike against it by the South African Government.

13. The signing of the Lusaka agreement by South Africa and Angola in February 1984 had afforded grounds for hope that there might be a genuine regional détente. Although South Africa implemented it only after some delay and with a certain reluctance, the agreement none the less led to the withdrawal of the South African troops that had been occupying southern Angola since August 1981. No sooner had that withdrawal taken place than the Pretoria Government launched a commando raid in Cabinda Province in the far north of Angola.

14. The facts, as stated by the representative of Angola and borne out by the statements of the South African prisoner, are overwhelming. They show that South Africa is pursuing a policy of brutal pressure against the countries of the region and that it is bending its efforts towards weakening their already shaky economies. France unreservedly condemns that effort to create destabilization being made in disregard of international law and in flagrant violation of Angolan sovereignty.

15. The attitude of the South African Government is a source of very great concern. The Angolan Government has drawn attention to other recent actions. It has also told us of its fear that South Africa is preparing another invasion of its territory. The South African authorities must be made to understand that that policy, which cannot fail to lead to further deaths and suffering, will in no way solve the problems of southern Africa.

16. When he spoke last week during the debate on the question of Namibia [*2583rd meeting*], the representative of South Africa enumerated the ground rules that the States of southern Africa should abide by. He pointed out, *inter alia*, that the problems of conflict in that region should be solved by peaceful means rather than by violence. That principle is actually universal. The peaceful settlement of disputes and refraining from the threat or use of force are, indeed, the very foundations of the Charter of the United Nations. France hopes to see them applied everywhere.

17. My delegation therefore urges South Africa to bring its deeds into line with its commitments and, by renouncing its present course of conduct, further, through dialogue, the solution of the problems of the region.

18. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): It is distressing to note the persistence of three phenomena in southern Africa which are interrelated because of *apartheid* and which, in spite of our collective or individual stands, seem to find the Council increasingly powerless. They are the repression of democratic liberation movements, the illegal occupation of an international Territory and acts of aggression against States in the region, acts for which, as all the world clearly sees, the racist régime of South Africa alone bears the guilt.

19. We keep being told that thanks to the criticisms—which are preferred to condemnations—to the suitable and

firm statements and to timely engagements, it is reasonable to say that the overall situation in southern Africa has improved—to the point where some even view as positive acts, especially from the vantage of a particular ideology, the South African régime's barely concealed attempts to impose its imperial will.

20. The pity is that, rightly or wrongly, we have held back from strict application of the Charter to counter that imperial will, and some circles claim that the attitude of the *apartheid* régime can be justified, or at least understood, without reference to the strict framework required by respect for international law. Yet is is clear that whatever the actual situation in the region may be—which is all too basic and obvious—South Africa cannot place itself above the law and base itself on rules grounded solely on the contumely with which they are vaunted.

21. We are all bound by the provisions of the Charter, which in this case are fleshed out by the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. None of those provisions—whether they involve the non-use or threat of force against the territorial integrity or independence of any State, the settlement of disputes by peaceful means, non-interference in the internal affairs of States or the sovereign equality of States—has been respected by South Africa.

22. Thus, blithely and with virtually assured impunity, South Africa sent a special forces commando unit against the Malongo oil installations in Angola. Thus it provides military *matériel* and explosives to UNITA (*National Union for the Total Independence of Angola*), which is completely in its pay and which is devoted to its wretched cause. Thus, it has massed troops and logistic support along the northern border of Namibia. All these measures of intimidation are intended, it seems, to ensure peace and security in the region through the use of State terrorism, repeated acts of sabotage and political and economic destabilization; but the fact is, they are egregious acts of aggression within the meaning of article 3 of the Definition of Aggression (*General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX) of 14 December 1974*).

23. In an attempt to justify its depredations, South Africa puts forward the supposed need to save Namibia in spite of the Namibians and evinces the determination to give chase to those terrorists who dare to speak out in favour of freedom, equal political participation, justice and social progress. Certain reactionary—not to say fascist—circles gladly go along with this, for it is considered necessary that the racist régime of South Africa entrench its domination in southern Africa and become, in a way which can be disturbing because of its clumsiness, the surrogate of special interests.

24. The People's Republic of Angola, with which, of course, we feel solidarity, continues to pay the high cost of that policy. We understand why it has been obliged to turn to the Security Council for the ninth time in its 10 years of independence. We pay a tribute to the Council for having adopted eight resolutions on Angola. Probably there will now be another such resolution, condemning South Africa, demanding that it withdraw its army from Angolan territory and cease the use of Namibia for its aggressive designs against Angola, and calling for redress and compensation for the material damage suffered by the victim.

25. But what assurances do we have that such actions will not be repeated? To what extent can we trust the *apartheid* régime, which has constantly reneged on its obligations? Are we to continue counting on the pragmatic gradualism of some and the reformism of others? We cound have found refuge in Article 6 and Chapter VII of the Charter had we been clear that the racist régime of South Africa could be considered as the enemy not only of Africans but of all mankind. Then international public opinion would no longer be abused by the impenitent defenders of universalism and persuasion.

26. We may be accused of being unrealistic, but at least our lack of realism will have the advantage of being based on the provisions of the Charter, which remains the sole valid basis for the decisions which the Council must take one day in order to carry out its responsibilities and its obligations towards the African people, and in particular the Angolan people, which also is entitled to security and development in a country whose sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity will finally be respected.

27. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like first to thank you, Sir, for the ideal way in which you are conducting our deliberations and for the great efforts you made during the recent series of meetings on the question of Namibia.

28. Unfortunately, the Council is meeting for the fourteenth time within a few days to discuss yet another of the grave problems caused by the abhorrent *apartheid* régime and the threat to peace and security posed by the actions of that régime towards neighbouring States, particularly the front-line States.

29. This morning we heard the statement of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Angola, who once again told of the acts of aggression against his country perpetrated by racist South Africa. If these acts of aggression show anything, they show, first and foremost, the extent of recklessness the *apartheid* régime has reached, and why it is rejected by the international community and by the conscience of mankind.

30. It is clear to everyone that this aggressive régime has decided to challenge the entire international community. Even knowing that the Security Council was to meet to consider the question of Namibia, the *apartheid* régime did not halt its acts of aggression; indeed, it began to carry out raids against sovereign States, first on the pretext of "hot pursuit" and then on other pretexts familiar to us all.

31. The fact is that from the international point of view that régime is an illegal one. It does not conform to inter-

national norms or to the standards set by mankind in general. We do not believe that such a régime can be dealt with in a conciliatory way or given any co-operation.

32. The world has just witnessed another flagrant attack against the sovereignty of the territory of Angola. In the face of this aggression the Council cannot fail to condemn South Africa for persisting in its acts of aggression against Angola and for the threat it poses to peace and security. With increasing urgency, we ask when the international community will act. When will the Council adopt the enforcement measures for which we have asked time and again?

33. We say that the time has come for the Council decisively to shoulder its responsibility to deal with those who insist on defying the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The issue is crystal-clear. Angola's appeal is a rightful one. The pretences of the Pretoria régime are totally invalid. In our opinion, the path the Council must take is also clear. There must be no compromise, no doubt. We are prepared to go along with the Council as far as it wishes to go. We hope that this will be sufficient to make the abhorrent Pretoria régime aware of the unequivocal stand of the international community.

34. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand): I had occasion recently, Sir, to extend my delegation's warmest congratulations to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of your country and to evince our sincere admiration for the way in which the Council's recent deliberations proceeded to a satisfactory conclusion. It is now my great pleasure, Sir, to say how happy we are to see you in the Chair at this important meeting.

35. Last week, during the Council debate on the question of Namibia, my delegation learned with indignation of the renewed aggression of South Africa against a neighbouring country, which took the form of the commando incursion at Cabinda, deep inside the People's Republic of Angola, on the morning of 21 May. My delegation also took note with grave concern of the message from the Minister of Defence of the People's Republic of Angola, annexed to document S/17263. That message stated that South Africa had increased its violations of Angolan sovereignty and territorial integrity, in particular its violations of Angola's national airspace.

36. During the debate on Namibia my delegation expressed its grave concern before, and strongly condemned the aggressive acts of South Africa. Hence my delegation has felt compelled to make a statement in today's meeting of the Council to consider the complaint made by Angola against South Africa.

37. Thailand shares the view of the other Member States which condemn the racist régime of South Africa for its renewed escalation of unprovoked, predatory and persistent acts of aggression against Angola, including the continued military occupation and violation of Angola's sovereignty, territorial integrity, and airspace. This unprovoked aggression by South Africa is not only in complete contravention of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international law but is also in blatant defiance of all the relevant Security Council decisions and resolutions.

38. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Angola informed the Council this morning that:

> "If the operation had succeeded, the toll would have been dozens dead, some of them American nationals. Damage would have amounted to at least $1 billion ... United States dollars, including a $216-million reconstruction of the onshore installation. It would have taken over a year to rebuild the Malongo oil installations, and the halt in production would have caused a loss of at least $770 million, in addition to stock worth $30 million." [*2596th meeting, para. 13.*]

Furthermore, the aggressive act by South Africa would have had widespread repercussions in other provinces of Angola. All that would mean heavy losses, particularly for a developing economy. In addition to the economic and financial costs must be mentioned the serious impact of political destabilization.

39. My delegation's position in this regard is clear and consistent: Thailand has consistently and in the strongest possible terms opposed and condemned South Africa's acts of aggression, as well as any foreign occupation and violation by one country of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of another country. Hence my delegation demands that the racist Pretoria régime desist from such lawless acts and immediately and unconditionally withdraw its occupation forces from the territory of Angola, compensate Angola for all the damage incurred and cease all further violations against the People's Republic of Angola. My delegation will therefore vote in support of the draft resolution in document S/17286.

40. Mr. ARIAS STELLA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): First, I extend to you Sir, my most sincere personal congratulations and the appreciation of my country for the efforts made by the presidency of the Council during the past weeks when we considered the question of Namibia. Thanks to your skills and fine diplomacy and those of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Trinidad and Tobago, if has proved possible to achieve results in keeping with the direct responsibilities of the Organization and in harmony with the human values and legal principles it is required to uphold.

41. My country is very disturbed by the way the Council's attention is constantly required by the situation in southern Africa owing to South Africa's obstinate reliance on force in that region.

42. From the dawn of its existence as an independent nation, the People's Republic of Angola has known the trauma of violence and occupation. This fate of Angolan history has still not changed, despite the express provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and successive resolutions of the Security Council.

43. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Angola has described to us here a situation which calls for the justified condemnation of the Council. The attack against the Malongo complex in Cabinda Province is unfortunately neither a new nor an isolated act. It is an act that is part of a long chain of events which show that South Africa clearly has a penchant for solutions of force combined with colonialist and racist practices which run directly counter to the very essence of the objectives of the United Nations. That attack, which struck at vital areas of the Angolan economy, makes it even more difficult to achieve the minimum conditions of living standards, progress and development which the Organization has an obligation to promote.

44. Peru, in keeping with its dedication to the cause of peace and its full adherence to the principles of international law as enshrined in the Charter, condemns South Africa's armed aggression in violation of the sovereignty, independence and integrity of Angola and the inviolability of that country's frontiers. We support Angola's right to demand adequate amends and compensation for the huge economic losses that it has suffered.

45. Lastly, my country cannot fail to express its deep disquiet at acts of aggression that undermine the atmosphere necessary for the machinery of dialogue and negotiation to stand some chance of success and for all States of the region that are neighbours of South Africa to be able to live in peace and devote their efforts to the arduous task of promoting the well-being of their peoples.

46. Mr. BASSOLE (Burkina Faso) (*interpretation from French*): First, I congratulate you, Sir, on the excellent way in which you have been guiding the Council's work and the great patience you have shown throughout our deliberations.

47. It is sad to note that for a whole week the racist régime of Pretoria has been at the centre of the attention of the Security Council and the international community. Indeed, the way in which that régime mocks the international community can only be attributed to one logic: to perpetuate *apartheid* in South Africa and illegally maintain its colonial presence in Namibia indefinitely.

48. Once again, the Council has heard Angola complain about the same aggressor. The facts are well established, and no one, here or elsewhere, can deny their veracity. Since the commando unit was caught red-handed, its own leader admitted its crime. As we heard in the statement made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Angola this morning, if the operation had succeeded it would have cost the lives of a number of Americans, among others.

49. Year after year the Council has been obliged to convene to hear the same complaint from the same plaintiff. The resolutions have grown in number, but not even their number or their content has led the South African racists to see reason.

50. The evidence is so persuasive that we have no doubt as to the outcome of our discussion. We are certain that this will result in a new condemnation of Pretoria—yet another condemnation that will doubtless meet the same fate as the others, that is, to be spurned by the racist régime of Pretoria.

51. Such conduct is possible only with the support, whether avowed or not, of those who, again yesterday, refused in the Council to impose sanctions on the Pretoria régime under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations which has so often been violated by that same régime.

52. We address ourselves to those who assure impunity to Pretoria and who sit around this table with us. We appeal to their conscience, over and above machiavellian political calculations, so that they will finally dare to put an end to a régime which has been utterly rejected by the international community. We call upon them to ensure that the countries neighbouring on South Africa will at long last be able to live free and in peace within secure boundaries and will also be able to devote their resources to thei. economic and social development.

53. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of South Africa. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

54. Mr. von SCHIRNDING (South Africa): During my statement to the Council on 10 June on the question of South West Africa [*2583rd meeting*], I dealt at length with the Cabinda incident. I should like today to expand on some of the points I made on that occasion.

55. Let me first of all restate once again what we have termed the ground rules for coexistence in southern Africa: first, no State should make its territory available to individuals and organizations wishing to promote or prepare violence against other States in the region; secondly, no foreign forces should be permitted to intervene in the region; thirdly, the problems of conflict in the region should be solved by peaceful means rather than by violence; fourthly, these problems should be solved on a regional basis by the leaders of the region themselves; and fifthly, although the States of our region have different socio-economic and political systems, we can live together in peace and harmony and work together in the pursuit of common interests. Each country of the region has the right to order its affairs as it deems fit, and inter-State relations, in particular between neighbours, should not be disturbed by differing internal policies. This is only sensible and practical, as recognition is accorded to the fact that each country has its own set of conditions for which it must seek its own solutions in the interests of its citizens. Divergent outlooks should not be allowed to distract Governments from carrying out their duty to accord their first priority to the welfare and prosperity of their peoples.

56. Is there anything unreasonable or unrealistic about these ground rules? Surely they provide the minimum basis for healthy intergovernmental relations anywhere.

57. The fact of the matter is that the MPLA (*Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola*) is providing facilities

for thousands of ANC (*African National Congress of South Africa*) terrorists on its territory. It is actively assisting the ANC in its training, arming and preparing for the perpetration of acts of terrorism against the peoples of South Africa. The MPLA government has not denied this, nor has it denied that it is supporting terrorist attacks of SWAPO (*South West Africa People's Organization*) against South West Africa. Indeed, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the MPLA régime this morning reaffirmed that commitment, and I quote from the text of his statement, when he said, "Angola will not stop giving its support to SWAPO and the freedom fighters of the people of Namibia and South Africa." [*2596th meeting, para. 28.*] There it is.

58. In accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, South Africa has sought a peaceful resolution of its dispute with Angola. In a number of ministerial meetings last year, it sought to persuade the MPLA régime to accept the advantages of peace. South Africa expressed its grave concern to the MPLA government over the activities of a large number of ANC terrorists in various parts of Angola. The South African Government repeatedly urged the MPLA government to remove these terrorists from its territory and to cease assisting them with training and equipment and by making its territory available to them for the furtherance of their violent activities. On 21 May 1984, the South African Government proposed that both South Africa and Angola should issue a joint declaration that they would not allow any person or organization to be trained or accommodated on their sovereign territory to operate against one another or to practise violence against one another. Thus far, the MPLA government has failed to respond to these representations.

59. As I have demonstrated, the South African Government has tried all peaceful channels in its endeavours to solve this problem. Having done so, it has no intention of apologizing for having taken appropriate action to counteract this threat. I stated in the Council as recently as last week, and I repeat today: we will not allow ourselves to be attacked with impunity. We shall take whatever action is necessary and appropriate to defend ourselves.

60. South Africa is confident that its actions have been in accordance with international law. It is an established principle that a State may not permit or encourage on its territory activities for the purpose of carrying out acts of violence on the territory of another State, and it is equally well established that a State has a right to take appropriate steps to protect its own security and territorial integrity against such acts.

61. As for the so-called testimony of Captain Du Toit, I do not believe that it would stand up in any reputable court of law. It is clear from the interview that Captain Du Toit was under the influence of drugs when he delivered his statement, which he was forced to read from a carefully edited text. Does any representative on the Council imagine that that statement represents anything like the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? Captain Du Toit's statement differs in important respects from the actual events surrounding the incident, especially with regard to the target of the operation. We challenge the Council to allow Captain Du Toit to appear before it to give his free and uncoerced version of what transpired.

62. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the MPLA régime had a great deal to say this morning about South Africa's alleged violation of Angolan territory. I have no intention of replying to his distortions, but let me once again remind members of the Council of the facts.

63. In terms of the Alvor Agreement, Portugal recognized three movements: FNLA (*National Front for the Liberation of Angola*), MPLA and UNITA. Those movements, together with Portugal, were to have formed a transitional government which would have held nation-wide elections for a constituent assembly before the end of October 1975. Those elections were never held, because the MPLA imported foreign troops into Angola to impose its rule over the country. That is a fact. There have never been free elections in Angola. Ever since then there has been a civil war in Angola, which is still far from being resolved. At the moment the MPLA controls the cities, but UNITA controls the countryside, where most of the people of Angola live.

64. For very good reasons, South Africa has not recognized the MPLA government, *inter alia*, because it was responsible for the collapse of the Alvor Agreement, because it is not in effective control of the greater part of Angola and because it would be incapable of maintaining itself without the support of foreign troops.

65. The South African Government believes that the people of Angola should themselves decide who their government should be. But the MPLA government has denied them the right so to decide in free elections. I should like to know which members of the Council believe that the Alvor Agreement has been honoured. I should like to know which members support the principle that there should be free and fair elections in Angola, and that the problems of that country should be resolved by reconciliation rather than violence.

66. Finally, I should like to call on all the members of the Council to join South Africa in calling for an international agreement for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Angola.

67. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Sao Tome and Principe. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

68. Mr. BRANCO (Sao Tome and Principe) (*interpretation from French*): Speaking on behalf of African countries whose official language is Portuguese—the Republic of Cape Verde, the Republic of Guinea-Bissau, the People's Republic of Mozambique and my own country—I should like to offer you, Sir, our most sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of June. I should also like, through you, to thank all members of the Council for giving us this opportunity to take part in the debate on the question now before it.

69. I am speaking in the Council after a week of debate in which the actions of South Africa in southern Africa have been the subject of profound analysis. Our delegations support the conclusions reached by the majority of representatives who spoke in that debate, that: first, the *apartheid* régime, because of its aggressive nature, its lack of respect for the principles and decisions of the United Nations, its support of many kinds for armed bands, its systematic violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law and its direct acts of aggression against the countries of the region, is a permanent source of destabilization, an obstacle to peace, progress and security in the region; secondly, that it is time—indeed, it is a matter of urgency—that the Security Council take effective measures to prevent and eliminate all the threats that the attacks by South Africa pose to peace and security in the region.

70. In January 1984, the Council met to consider the item entitled "Complaint by Angola against South Africa" and adopted resolution 546 (1984). In that resolution the Council expressed its grave concern about persistent acts of aggression, including military occupation, committed by the racist régime of South Africa, in violation of the sovereignty, airspace and territorial integrity of Angola. After condemning those barbaric acts, the Council demanded that the racist régime should cease immediately its acts of aggression and unconditionally withdraw its occupation forces from Angola and scrupulously respect the sovereignty, airspace, territorial integrity and independence of Angola. The Council reaffirmed in the same resolution the right of Angola, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and in particular Article 51, to take all the measures necessary to defend and safeguard its sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence.

71. In spite of the demonstrations of good will on the part of the People's Republic of Angola with a view to finding a peaceful, just and lasting solution in southern Africa, in spite of its readiness to participate in complex and serious negotiations in order to end the impasse created with regard to the problem of Namibia, in spite of the willingness of other States to help in the search for realistic solutions, South Africa has given striking proof by its most recent actions of its lack of good will and its desire to perpetuate its domination in Namibia by putting forward unacceptable pretexts, creating false obstacles and using armed bands against the neighbouring countries that support the just cause of the Namibian people.

72. We completely share the concerns of the international community in connection with this added dimension in the escalation of acts of aggression committed by the racist South African régime in the region. Proof of that escalation, if any were needed, has been provided once again through the acts of terrorist intervention against Angola and Botswana. We firmly condemn those acts, all the more so since we have links of solidarity with those countries developed during our shared fight against colonialism and well understand the Angolan people's desire for peace following the decades of war imposed upon it. We call for the cessation of all acts of violence against the States of the region and strict respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola.

73. The policy of our five States has always been based on unswerving defence of and respect for the principles of sovereignty, national independence, territorial integrity and non-interference in the affairs of States.

74. As was reaffirmed once again by the heads of State of the People's Republic of Angola, the Republic of Cape Verde, the Republic of Guinea-Bissau, the People's Republic of Mozambique and the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe in the Declaration of Sao Tome, adopted at the Fifth Summit of Heads of State of the African countries whose official language is Portuguese,

> "The summit declares its unconditional support for all the initiatives and measures that have been and will be taken by the People's Republic of Angola and by the People's Republic of Mozambique to defend the sovereignty, territorial integrity, national unity and accomplishments of the peoples of those respective countries.
>
> "Within its means, and bearing in mind the historic tradition of shared struggle and sacrifices, the summit reaffirms its resolve to give multifaceted support to the People's Republic of Angola and the People's Republic of Mozambique."

75. Loyal to that tradition and aware of the need once and for all to put an end to acts of aggression perpetrated by South Africa against the neighbouring States of the region, we ask the Council to take appropriate action. We hope that the Council will assume the responsibilities assigned to it by the Charter, which in our view remains the most appropriate means of strengthening international peace and security.

76. Mr. OUDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): For 10 years now, starting in 1975, the racist South African régime has been waging war against Angola. Numerous resolutions have been adopted by the Security Council emphatically demanding that South Africa immediately and unconditionally withdraw its occupation troops from the territory of the People's Republic of Angola, that it put an end to all acts of aggression and other subversive actions against that State and that it strictly respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola.

77. However, today the Council is obliged yet again to consider the question of new aggressive military actions by South Africa against Angola which constitute a gross breach of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola and seriously jeopardize international peace and security.

78. The racist South African régime is at all costs and in every possible way clinging to its policies in southern Africa. It is seeking to perpetuate its rule in Namibia, to intimidate Angola and the other front-line States and to

force them off their peace-loving and independent course. It is seeking to impose its diktat on the independent neighbouring African countries to obstruct the progressive socio-economic changes in those countries and to preserve and safeguard the *apartheid* régime.

79. As has already been pointed out, the fundamental reason for this aggressive, reactionary position of South Africa and the principal obstacle to the elimination of colonialism, racism and *apartheid* in southern Africa, as well as to a just and effective solution of the problems of the security of the peace-loving independent African States, is the close so-called constructive engagement which links the United States and a number of other Western countries and Israel with that régime, and their support for it.

80. By its most recent acts the Pretoria régime has yet again quite clearly shown its true aggressive nature. While hypocritically holding forth about the need for a peaceful settlement of the problems of southern Africa, Pretoria has worked unceasingly to destabilize the situation in Angola. South Africa's declaration of its so-called peaceful intentions towards Angola is but the latest in a number of mendacious and propagandistic manouevres.

81. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic wishes to declare its full solidarity with the valiant people of Angola, which has taken up arms to defend its freedom and independence. We resolutely condemn South Africa's continuing aggression against Angola, including the act of aggression it has perpetrated in Cabinda Province, and we demand its immediate cessation, the unconditional and prompt withdrawal of all South African troops from Angolan territory and the cessation of all acts of aggression against that country.

82. In our opinion, it is necessary for the Council to take resolute measures to put an end to the aggressive actions of South Africa against Angola. In paragraph 7 of its resolution 475 (1980), the Council decided

> "to meet again in the event of further acts of violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola by the South African racist régime, in order to consider the adoption of more effective measures in accordance with the appropriate provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, including Chapter VII thereof."

83. The adoption of such measures by the Council against the racists is in our opinion long overdue. The Council must most resolutely condemn the racist Pretoria régime for its continuing acts of aggression against Angola and demand that it immediately put an end to them. The Council must oblige South Africa unconditionally to respect the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Angola.

84. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR supports the draft resolution in document S/17286.

85. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Cuba. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

86. Mr. ORAMAS OLIVA (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): As a fellow inhabitant of Latin America and the Caribbean, I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. Your proven talents and diplomatic skills promise that the work of the Council will be characterized by your well-established dedication to the freedom and independence of peoples.

87. May I also express my appreciation to the representative of Thailand for his dedicated work at the head of the Council last month.

88. The People's Republic of Angola, in the person of its President, Mr. José Eduardo dos Santos, has been compelled to request this urgent meeting of the Council to denounce another repugnant and cynical act of aggression by the racist Government of Pretoria against his country.

89. On 21 May, South African commandos landed in Cabinda, more than 2,500 kilometres from the South African border, and, in a clash with a small patrol of Angolan forces, were defeated in a matter of minutes; two South African soldiers died and their leader, a captain, was taken prisoner. Two other captains and five soldiers from the group escaped into the forest.

90. A few days later, the leader of the commando group acknowledged before journalists in Luanda that the instructions he had received had been to destroy the oil installations of Cabinda Gulf Oil at Malongo, in Cabinda Province. The startling thing is that those installations belong to an American transnational corporation—Gulf Oil. We hope that the Government of the United States will take vigorous measures in response to this offence by the Pretoria racists, as some in that country have recently requested.

91. Surprised by the defeat and taken aback by the irrefutable evidence held by the Angolan authorities, Pretoria, through the Chief of Staff of its fascistic army, General Viljoen, stated that the mission of the infiltrators was to gather intelligence on SWAPO and ANC bases in Cabinda. In other words, the South African racists had to acknowledge that they were violating the sovereignty of a State, in this case Angola, and that they were sending a unit of their regular army into the territory of that country. What right allows racist South Africa to violate the most basic norms of international law?

92. The perfidy of the racist leaders of Pretoria could not be more insolent and flagrant. The racist authorities said that they were seeking information on ANC and SWAPO camps in Cabinda. These emulators of Hitler are cynical and brazen, since they know that there have never been ANC or SWAPO camps or groups in Cabinda. Only the oil installations are there.

93. The abortive Malongo action demonstrates the treachery and criminality of the Pretoria racists, whose system of *apartheid* now smells of putrefaction. Its megalomania, arrogance, false and fatuous sense of superiority, lack of scruples and disdain for other human beings go so far as to sabotage the economic installations of its major American allies and endanger the lives of American citizens. This deed also clearly demonstrates that UNITA is nothing but an instrument of the Nazi-racists of Pretoria and that it perpetrates criminal actions against the Angolan people when it receives orders from its bosses, who in turn carry out wide-ranging terrorist actions in the name of their lackeys. This is obvious from the fact that among the materials captured from the criminal commando group was propaganda of that counter-revolutionary organization and paint, to be used to spread the rumor that it had been an action of the UNITA bandits.

94. The racists learned a powerful lesson at Malongo, and the fighting spirit of FAPLA (People's Armed Forces for the Liberation of Angola) has strengthened considerably.

95. The South African racists are among the best disciples of Goebbels. Lying is one of their most frequently used tools, which is why we must refer to what was stated in the *Jornal de Angola* of 24 May:

> "The attempt to sabotage the Malongo oil installations, carried out directly by the regular army of Pretoria, is part of a vast plan of political and economic destabilization of Angola, in which the racist régime of Pretoria is deeply involved. It should be recalled that it was with the same objective that the Pretoria commandos carried out another sabotage operation against the installations of the Petrangol refinery at Luanda, the Giraul Bridge, the Lobito oil tanks and two ships that were moored in the port of Luanda. It has now been proven that all of this was the work of elements of the same unit found in Cabinda."

96. Had the sabotage of the Gulf Oil installations at Malongo been successful, the Angolan economy would have suffered losses calculated at almost $1 billion and dozens, perhaps even hundreds, of foreign and Angolan technicians would have lost their lives, including the 178 American technicians. It must be borne in mind that the oil tanks are some 100 metres away from the housing complexes of those technicians and that, had the tanks exploded, those homes and complexes would have been destroyed as well.

97. Is it not clear that those who support Pretoria are encouraging the racists in these criminal practices? Is it not time for those who advocate the policy of constructive engagement to put an end to that honeyed rhetoric and stop supporting a Government which is as irresponsible and criminal as is that of Pretoria? Everyone is familiar with the aggressive policy of South Africa against neighbouring countries, which has caused the loss of thousands of lives and countless material damage. Who violates human rights so systematically as South Africa?

98. The faint reaction of the United States Administration to this criminal act of State terrorism which could have cost the lives of many Americans is not surprising, since that act was the result of the encouragement that Pretoria receives from United States economic, political, diplomatic and military aid.

99. This demonstrates the synicism and duplicity of the Washington authorities when they speak out against what they describe as international terrorism. And how are we to interpret the fact that they have just repealed the Clark amendment? In all logic, South Africa is today more aggressive than it was when the Constructive engagement policy of Washington did not exist.

100. It is clear that there is a sharp contrast, if not an abyss, between the position of Angola and that of South Africa. Angola has been flexible, reasonable and constructive on all aspects leading towards peace, independence and security in south-western Africa, in its well-known platform, the supplementary text to that platform, and in its daily attitude.

101. South Africa has responded to Angola's attitude by policy of State terrorism and by deceptions. The racist Government announced one year after the deadline set in the Lusaka agreement that it had withdrawn its troops from the south of Angola, but the truth is that some units are still in Calueque. This recalls the pretext used to invade Angola in 1975, since now, as then, they use the same pretext, that it is "to safeguard the Calueque Dam". Since when have the Pretoria racists acted with such generosity towards the black Africans? The ill-famed Buffalo Battalion is stationed with the troops of UNITA in the vicinity of the Namibian border, in the Angolan province of Cuando Cubango.

102. South Africa has been using negotiations with Angola to gain time in which to prepare new commando sabotage forces and to create conditions for a so-called internal settlement in Namibia.

103. It is imperative for the Council to assume its responsibilities *vis-à-vis* the international community and to adopt the measures needed to put an end to racist South Africa's insane policy against its neighbours and to require its allies to stop their honeyed conduct, which only fuels the criminal and fascistic attitude of the *apartheid* leaders.

104. Cuba believes that the Council must take the following steps: first, demand the unconditional withdrawal forthwith of all South African occupation troops from southern Angola; secondly, strongly condemn South Africa for its violation of the sovereignty of Angola, which the South Africans themselves admit when they state officially that the group that was at Malongo was on an intelligence-gathering mission; thirdly, condemn South Africa for its attempt to attack and destroy the Gulf Oil installations in Cabinda, which would have cost the lives of Angolan and foreign technicians; fourthly, demand that South Africa implement, without further delay, resolution 435 (1978), and thus restore a climate of peace to which the peoples of southern Africa keenly aspire: and, fifthly, demand that South Africa's allies cease all forms of sup-

port for the *apartheid* régime, which encourage it in its criminal policy, and in particular the policy of so-called constructive engagement.

105. The Pretoria Government must be given a deadline for the implementation of those steps, and if that deadline is not met, the Council will have no alternative but to adopt the comprehensive and mandatory sanctions set forth in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

106. At the very moment we were meeting to consider the question of Namibia here in the Council, the Pretoria racists, in a demonstration of their proverbial contempt for justice and for the sovereignty of other States, launched a criminal commando incursion into the capital of Botswana on the pretext of eliminating freedom-fighters of the ANC, causing the deaths of a number of civilians and the destruction of several buildings. Because it is a repeated practice and an outrage on the part of Pretoria, more than by statements, that crime alone deserves to be met with severe sanctions.

107. The racists and those who support them must not forget that the patience of peoples has its limits.

'08. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the German Democratic Republic, who has asked to make a statement in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Eastern European Socialist States for the month of June. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

109. Mr. SCHLEGEL (German Democratic Republic): Allow me to convey through you, Sir, to your Minister for Foreign Affairs, our high approval for the manner in which he conducted the work of the Council during the debate on the question of Namibia. We are sure that you will spare no efforts to reach a successful conclusion to this present debate. I should like to thank you and the members of the Council for giving me the opportunity to speak in my capacity as Chairman of the Group of Eastern European Socialist States on the continued policy of aggression and destabilization by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola.

110. In the course of the Council's debate on the question of Namibia, socialist States unequivocally condemned the racists' manoeuvres to bring about an "internal settlement" and further to misuse Namibian territory for military acts against neighbouring States. Now the *apartheid* régime is again in the pillory. While this body was considering steps for settling the question of Namibia and thus to improve the situation in the entire region of southern Africa, the rulers in Pretoria again had the audacity brutally to express their cynical contempt for the will of the international public. They launched an attack against Gaborone, the capital of Botswana, and they have escalated their permanent attacks and acts of interference against sovereign Angola.

111. A few days ago [*2586th meeting*], during the debate on Namibia, and again today, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Angola furnished impressive proof of the continued acts of aggression and destabilization perpetrated by Pretoria against his country. The flagrant violation of the sovereignty of Angola and other independent States in the region proves that the racists' peace declarations are null and void. In contrast to Angola, South Africa is not willing to adhere to the arrangements agreed to in Lusaka in February 1984.

112. Angola, with which the socialist countries are linked by fraternal bonds, was for centuries oppressed under the colonial yoke. Over the past decade it has made great efforts, with the diligence and commitment of its citizens, to construct a new, humanist society, for which endeavour it needs peace more than aything else. It needs peace for the accomplishment of social progress and for economic development. During the first decade of its independence, Angola has not experienced that badly needed peace.

113. Acts of sabotage against Angola, violations of its airspace, continued occupation of Angolan territory and outside support for counter-revolutionary UNITA gangs are only a few of the tesserae in the blood-stained mosaic of Pretoria's subversion and aggression against the young People's Republic. During the 10 years of its existence, Angola, jointly with Cuban internationalists, has repeatedly had to repulse direct armed attacks of the racists. Because of the concentration of troops on its southern border, the danger of new, large-scale South African acts of aggression is imminent. It thus becomes clear that the so-called linkage is intended only to divert attention from the real causes of the dangerous situation in the region.

114. Angola is compelled to spend huge sums of money on the maintenance and strengthening of its defence capacity, sums that must be diverted from the implementation of tasks in the field of its domestic policy and economy. Further, it is almost daily challenged by irreplaceable losses of human life and immense material damages because of Pretoria's war. That is Pretoria's precise aim: to weaken the progressive system and thereby be able to impose its will upon that country.

115. The bomb attack attempted by a South African commando unit against the plant at Malongo in Cabinda at the end of May is the latest of many links in the chain of acts of systematic sabotage. The criminal attempt against the economic heart of Angola would, had it not been foiled, have resulted in the loss of at least $1 billion to the country, as the Minister for Foreign Affairs told us this morning. President dos Santos has stated that half of that amount of money would be sufficient to provide food for one year to the entire population of Angola.

116. But there is more to it than that. In their attempted bomb attack, the South African terrorists unscrupulously and in cold blood were aware of the possibility of the death of many more people, since there is a large inhabited area in the vicinity of the tanks. Who, in view of the revelation by the leader of the terrorist group of the aims of this latest act of sabotage, is not disgusted at the response of the racists? They have had the impudence cynically to attempt to justify that action by citing an alleged search for members of the ANC and SWAPO.

117. Who gives Pretoria the right to send its gangs of killers into sovereign Angola? Who gives Pretoria the right to launch an attack against the capital of another sovereign State, Botswana, and to murder innocent people? The answer is that the racists arrogate that right to themselves, because they regard themselves as rulers in that region and possess a sophisticated military machine. Nor must we forget that they know only too well that at their side are mighty allies, namely the most reactionary circles of imperialism, which are interested in aggravating the international situation. Thanks to them, Pretoria has so far been able with impunity to carry murder and aggression beyond its own borders into independent sovereign States.

118. We vigorously condemn the racists' policy of terror, especially the continuation of their undeclared war against the People's Republic of Angola.

119. Condemnation alone, however, is not sufficient. Pretoria's acts of aggression, violating international law, must be given a proper answer in the form of resolute measures. In common with the majority of non-aligned States, we call for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. Any prevention of such measures by members of the Council is only bound to encourage the frenzied racists to commit new crimes, and will make those members accomplices in those crimes. There is no doubt that the policy of Pretoria has become a serious threat to international peace and security.

120. One point must be clear: if there is anyone who believes that, having thrown off the yoke of colonialism, the African States can be blackmailed, that person is mistaken. Historical progress can for a certain time be impeded, perhaps even halted, but it can never be prevented.

121. The Eastern European socialist States stand in firm solidarity at the side of the Angolan people and the peoples of the other front-line States in their struggle against the aggressive and colonialist *apartheid* régime and for the maintenance of independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. We support the constructive policy of Angola directed towards peace and security in the region. The proposals submitted by the People's Republic of Angola and contained in the letter dated 17 November 1984 from President dos Santos to the Secretary-General [*S/16838*] make it clear again who is really interested in a stable situation in southern Africa.

122. Let me therefore express the hope that by an unambiguous decision the Council will support those who are the victims of the policy of *apartheid*. It is up to the Council to see to it that the 10-year war in Angola is finally followed by the peace which that country has been longing for so eagerly.

123. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Argentina. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

124. Mr. MUÑIZ (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Only a few days ago I conveyed our congratulations to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Trinidad and Tobago on his assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. I wish on this occasion to reiterate yet again our congratulations and to express our satisfaction at seeing you, Sir, in the Chair. I am convinced that with the high diplomatic qualities you have demonstrated on so many occasions you will be able successfully to guide the work of the Council in this important debate.

125. Before I set out the particular position of my country, I want to say that we are in complete agreement with the settlement made by the representative of the Bahamas, which was a precise reflection of the clear and unanimous position on this issue of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States.

126. The repeated violations of the territorial sovereignty of Angola by South African armed forces and intelligence personnel deserve the unanimous condemnation of the international community and an appropriate response on the part of the Council. The events that led to this meeting are all the more serious as they violate agreements painstakingly negotiated between Angola and South Africa and constitute dangerous new obstacles to the search for balance and harmony in south-western Africa.

127. Only a few days ago, during the Council's consideration of the situation in Namibia, my delegation stated that because of its racist, colonialist and violent nature the foreign policy of South Africa is largely incompatible with an international order based on the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and intended to ensure the maintenance of international peace and security and the development of harmonious relations and co-operation among States. We repeat this today.

128. In something less than one week, South Africa has taken three actions contrary to specific provisions of the Charter and relevant United Nations resolutions. The incursion by intelligence forces into Angola, the barbaric and unjustifiable attack on Botswana and the installation of an interim administration in Namibia are three grave challenges to the credibility and effectiveness of the United Nations. Argentina firmly condemns those actions, and believes that the Council should not remain indifferent in the face of this situation, which further endangers the prospects for peace in southern Africa.

129. Argentina firmly supports the quest for peaceful and negotiated solutions to the different problems of southern Africa. The complexity of the conflicts to be resolved in that region is such that only dialogue and concerted action among all the parties can ensure a stable future. It would seem clear that there is no room for solutions imposed unilaterally or that disregard the legitimate interests of given sectors or countries. Insistence on extreme courses of action and proposals would only contribute to an indefinite extension of the confrontations and tragedy in southern Africa.

130. That is why we have observed with renewed interest the diplomatic processes that in recent days seem to give hope for prompt and genuine independence to Namibia

and the establishment of new parameters in relations between South Africa and other African States. As for certain internal measures within South Africa itself, we do not believe that they represent valid alternatives to *apartheid*, the complete and definitive eradication of which is essential. The recent military operations in Angola and Botswana and an inflexible insistence on unacceptable preconditions for Namibia's independence eloquently prove the intolerance and violence that characterize the South African Government's position.

131. At this advanced stage of a century which has seen unprecedented progress in human and international relations, Pretoria's policies represent a dangerous moral and political anachronism, incompatible with the very values that the South African Government affirms or claims to defend. Evidence of that is the increasingly active and concrete opposition to those policies in regions that have traditional links with South Africa. Pretoria should not ignore or underestimate the importance of clear signs that point to its growing isolation at the international level. Those who continue to link their destiny to *apartheid* should understand that rigidity and intransigence are the worst enemies of their own interests. It is time for the South African leaders to awaken to the truth and carry out the profound changes so justly demanded by Africa and the rest of the international community.

132. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Yugoslavia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

133. Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia): For the second time in several days, the Council is deliberating on the consequences of military aggression and occupation by South Africa. For the second time the Council is trying to find an adequate response to South Africa's policy of aggression, which is threatening international peace and security.

134. South Africa is increasingly using force and military aggression against independent African countries and peoples. The *apartheid* régime has two faces, equally ugly and equally repugnant: that of internal oppression and institutionalized terror, and that of intimidation, State terrorism and military aggression visited upon its neighbours. The armed aggression against Angola, occupation of part of that independent and non-aligned country and criminal forays into other parts of Angola represent the true face of *apartheid*.

135. A Conference of the Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries will be held at the beginning of September of this year at Luanda. We understand the aggression and subversion by South Africa against Angola to be meant as pressure against all the non-aligned countries as well. This attempt to intimidate the non-aligned countries will fail, as have other such attempts.

136. It will be recalled that the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983, strongly condemned the continued military occupation of part of Angolan territory and underlined that it considered that to be an act of aggression against the non-aligned countries. It demanded the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African troops and decided to increase support for and solidarity with the people and Government of Angola [*S/15675 and Corr.1 and 2, annex, sect. I, para. 62*]. Sovereign and non-aligned Angola needs peace to be able to proceed with the solution of its economic and social development problems.

137. Military aggression against Angola violates the basic norms of international conduct and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The use of force, occupation, intervention, interference in internal affairs and destabilization of Governments of independent countries are crimes in southern Africa just as they are in the rest of the world. We believe it is the obligation of the Council to respond adequately to such behaviour.

138. The countries maintaining relations and co-operating with South Africa should heed the voice of reason and understand that any co-operation with South Africa is detrimental to peace and stability in the region and blocks international efforts aimed at eliminating *apartheid* and achieving independence and self-determination for the people of Namibia, as well as the liberation of the oppressed black population of South Africa. Those countries should use the weight that they carry with South Africa to make it change its policy.

139. This time, the Council should find and adopt adequate measures to prevent aggression and protect and defend the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola and other front-line States; it should strongly condemn South Africa; and it should use all means at its disposal under the Charter to make South Africa withdraw unconditionally from Angola, respect its sovereignty and territorial integrity, and appropriately redress the damages it has inflicted.

140. We believe that the Council should send a clear message to South Africa that the international community, the United Nations and the Security Council will no longer tolerate its policy of aggression, occupation and colonialism.

141. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Sudan, who wishes to make a statement in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States for the month of June. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

142. Mr. BIRIDO (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, I thank you and the members of the Council for affording my delegation the opportunity to speak on behalf of the Group of Arab States on the issue under discussion. We do so on the basis of solidarity and the joint struggle by the Arab and African States against the powers of occupation, hegemony and Zionist and colonialist racist expansionism.

143. The issue under discussion is the current situation in Angola resulting from the acts of aggression committed by

the racist Government of South Africa against an independent African State which in the past has been the victim of blatant aggression against its people and soil, a State which now lives under a permanent and dangerous threat posed by the Government of South Africa.

144. This morning we listened to the comprehensive statement of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Angola; and we have read document S/17263, reproducing the text of a message from the Minister of Defence of the People's Republic of Angola to the Council in which he reviewed the chain of acts of aggression and provocation directed by the South African Government against his country.

145. One of the most dangerous acts of aggression was the attempt to attack the oil installations in Cabinda on 21 May this year, including overflights by South African aeroplanes over various regions of Angola. There is also the fact that South Africa is maintining along its border with Angola armed forces totalling more than 20,000, which shows that the Pretoria régime is indeed preparing for a new invasion of Angola.

146. South Africa's repeated acts of aggression against Angola represent a flagrant breach of Angola's independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty and are, furthermore, a flagrant violation of United Nations resolutions and the principles of international law. These acts of aggression threaten international peace and security. For those reasons the Arab States have strongly condemned the latest acts of aggression perpetrated by South Africa against Angola, and we call upon the Council strongly to condemn such acts. We call upon it to demand that South Africa withdraw its forces from Angola and cease all acts of aggression against Angola as well as against all other front-line States.

147. Yesterday the Council concluded long and fruitful deliberations in which more than 80 representatives participated, including a large number of Foreign Ministers of non-aligned countries. All those speakers condemned the practices and acts of aggression carried out by racist South Africa in Namibia and within South Africa itself. They further condemned South Africa's acts of aggression and continued provocation committed against the neighbouring front-line African States. Following these deliberations and consultations, the Council adopted resolution 566 (1985). Furthermore, on 3 May last, the President of the Council issued a statement on the decision taken in Pretoria to establish a so-called interim government in Namibia [*S/17151*]. On the other hand, the United Nations Council for Namibia held a special meeting on 17 June, on which the Acting President of that Council reported to us in detail yesterday [*2595th meeting*].

148. The Security Council will meet shortly to discuss South Africa's acts of aggression committed against another independent African State, the Republic of Botswana.

149. All these facts reveal the state of despair and isolation of the Pretoria régime owing to the increasing opposition campaigns in the interior undertaken by the valiant people of South Africa, under the leadership of the militant national liberation movements, as well as to the increasing awareness and concern over the policy of *apartheid* and the occupation of Namibia. This concern is reflected in the growing number of demonstrations in many countries and in the administrative and legislative resolutions adopted by many countries to strengthen the boycott and promote the isolation imposed on the Pretoria régime.

150. However, despite this growing denunciation, the Pretoria régime continues to obtain assistance from some Western States and Israel. Over the years this situation has led to strengthening the security and military institutions of South Africa and to enhancing the economic potential of the racist régime. This economic potential has grown continuously and the monopolistic interests and Western companies have prospered despite the opposition of public opinion in their countries.

151. The negative role assumed by some permanent members of the Security Council and other States—either to protect economic interests binding them to the racist régime in South Africa or to further individual strategic ambitions by providing assistance to a régime that has been rejected by the international community in both form and substance—has prevented the Council from fully undertaking its responsibilities in maintaining international peace and security, achieving independence for Namibia and eradicating *apartheid* in South Africa, as well as in putting an end to the acts of aggression and military incursions carried out by South Africa against neighbouring States.

152. Arab-African solidarity has a very strong basis of many years' standing. This solidarity has been reflected in the struggles carried out jointly for liberation from colonialism, racism and zionism, in particular where cooperation between South Africa and Israel has increased at the economic, military and technological levels, thus helping both racist régimes to continue their policy of occupation in Namibia, Palestine and the occupied Arab territories. For that reason, the Arab States have always supported the peoples of South Africa and the front-line States through various channels—whether bilateral, regional or international—in their just struggle against the Pretoria régime. In this context, the Council of the Arab League of States at its most recent meeting, held at Tunis, issued a special decision in support of liberation movements in southern Africa, in terms of which it:

> "First, stresses the firm position of the Arab States in their condemnation of the policy of *apartheid* practised by the racist régime of South Africa and their support and assistance for the liberation struggle of the peoples of southern Africa to attain self-determination, freedom and dignity, and calls for practical steps to eradicate the policy of *apartheid*;
>
> "Secondly, renews full support for the people of Namibia in their struggle for independence and calls for the immediate, unconditional implementation of Secu-

rity Council resolution 435 (1978) on the independence of Namibia;

"Thirdly, condemns the alliance and co-operation between the racist régimes in Pretoria and Tel Aviv, an alliance which is a violation of the legitimate rights of the African and Arab peoples;

"Fourthly, emphasizes the solidarity with the popular, intensifying struggle of the majority in South Africa against the unjust racist laws, and condemns the South African racist régime's attempt to impose military conscription on black citizens;

"Fifthly, condemns the recent barbaric massacres perpetrated by the racist régime in South Africa, in which a large number of black citizens fell victim;

"Sixthly, salutes those political militants who are languishing in the prisons of the racist régimes, particularly Nelson Mandela, and calls for their immediate, unconditional release."

153. Finally, we should like to renew the Arab States' pledge of full support for the People's Republic of Angola in its struggle to defend its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. We further unreservedly condemn the acts of aggression of the racist Government of South Africa against Angola. We call upon it to put an end to all its aggressive acts and to respect Namibia's sovereignty and independence.

154. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Congo. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

155. Mr. GAYAMA (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): The Congolese delegation is particularly pleased, Sir, to see you once again in the Chair, where in the past few days the Minister for Foreign Affairs of your country and you yourself have shown outstanding skill in the conduct of the debate on Namibia. In fact, we should have been glad if you could have enjoyed a well-deserved rest, but there is always the unpredictable factor of South Africa to be taken into account.

156. It is not surprising that the racist, neo-fascist and colonialist Pretoria régime is once again the focus of our debate. If the opposite were the case it would mean that the régime had been converted to the ideals of peace and good-neighbourliness and to the principles of non-interference in the affairs of others and respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of its neighbours. We doubt that has happened, not deliberately, but on the basis of observations supported by the facts, which tell us more about the nature of the South African régime than all the recent rhetoric about its alleged evolution. A few days ago, while the Council was considering a precise item on its agenda, namely, the situation in Namibia, with the object of evaluating the situation resulting from the failure to implement its resolution 435 (1978), the representative of the racist régime put forward an astonishing argument on the internal situation in Angola. Obviously, in order to justify its raid into northern Angola, South Africa needed to convince the whole world of the untold benefits of its continued occupation of the south of that country.

157. South Africa's occupation of part of southern Angola derives, as everyone knows, from a premeditated act of aggression about three years ago. That occupation was preceded by numerous armed raids, causing many casualties and very heavy damage to property, and was to all intents and purposes a genuine, unprovoked war. The stated purpose of the racist Pretoria Government was to guarantee a so-called defence of Namibia against SWAPO, overlooking the fact that SWAPO's principal strength comes from inside the country, from the Namibian people opposed to South Africa's illegal colonial presence, and not from outside. In fact, as far as one can tell, the South African régime's demonstrations of force have not at all weakened the resistance and the struggle against that miserable régime and the undesirable power that it embodies.

158. Wishing to be helpful to certain of its allies in the Western world and seeking to please so-called moderate sections of opinion, the South African Government is anxious to depict itself as a reliable bulwark against what some describe as the expansion of communism. Therefore, through its occupation of part of Angolan territory, it has been able to conclude a marriage of convenience with the UNITA rebels, who were disconsolate at having been rejected by the Angolan people 10 years ago, at the moment of independence, despite the intervention of South Africa itself.

159. There was even some question recently of the creation of a so-called Democratic International grouping together, under the aegis of South Africa and with the blessing of a super-Power, a ragtag band of embittered reactionaries, ready to sacrifice the least negotiable interests of Africa, such as the struggle against *apartheid* and colonialism—in other words, ready even to ally themselves with the devil himself in order to realize their obsessive impulses. As, moreover, that plan required a symbol, an "Open sesame", South Africa found it sufficient to trumpet the refrain, not in Africa, but elsewhere, of a supposed danger caused by the presence of Cuban troops in Angola. It was to the sound of that refrain that the implementation of the United Nations settlement plan for Namibia was boycotted, relegating to obscurity the only question that truly remained to be negotiated—that of the electoral system.

160. Apart from the grave infringement of the principles of non-interference and respect by States for the sovereignty of others represented by South Africa's discussion of problems coming within the sole competence of the Angolan Government at Luanda, such action clearly shows the contempt in which the racist régime holds the African peoples. Demonstrating that contempt, the régime that invented in its own country the phenomenon of bantustans would like to extend that experiment outside South Africa, by denying to sovereign countries, members of the Organization of African Unity and Members of the United Nations, the right to govern themselves as they please and

the right to choose their own political and socio-economic régimes and their own partners. Even if the independent African countries have their defects, which they do not seek to conceal, at least they have never institutionalized a crime against humanity comparable to *apartheid*. It is *apartheid* that renders the South African régime unfit and makes it incapable of leading a normal life, both in Africa and in the world at large.

161. South Africa therefore cannot seek to impose its will on the rest of Africa and the rest of the world. It is up to South Africa to adapt itself—and not by surprising us with picturesque details of so-called open-door operations in restaurants, hotels and other public places or by the imminence of mixed marriages. South Africa will represent nothing, whatever its brutality, if it deliberately turns its back on justice and morality, both against the majority of people within its borders and outside them.

162. A few days ago, within this very chamber, we emphasized that South Africa, because of the values it represents, was incapable of inspiring and promoting even the most insignificant peace policy. On the contrary, it constitutes a permanent source of insecurity for its neighbours, with clear dangers to international peace and security. How else can one explain the defiance Pretoria has shown to the world and to the Organization by organizing and perpetrating acts of aggression, first against Angola and then against Botswana, on 14 June last, at the very moment when the Council was discussing the subject?

163. Aggression is an intrinsic part of the political behaviour of South Africa. That is what explains the permanent danger hanging over virtually all the front-line States. Without drawing up a complete list, I would observe that the acts of aggression against Lesotho, Zambia, Zimbabwe and Mozambique are too fresh in the memories of all of us for me to need to refer to them individually.

164. In declaring recently that it regarded itself as a regional Power, South Africa was saying nothing new to those who recalled its acts of intervention at the time of the wars of liberation in Angola, Zimbabwe and Mozambique, when it tried, albeit unsuccessfully, to alter the course of history in its favour, just as it is trying to do today. To show its intentions, it declared itself ready to intervene wherever and whenever it saw fit south of the Equator, which it regards as its zone of influence, its living space, as it were, in terms of sound expansionist logic. Thus South African participation in the mercenary aggression against the Seychelles, out in the Indian Ocean, in November 1981 was no surprise either. Even less of a surprise was the bizarre commando raid that took place this month in Cabinda, in northern Angola, on 21 May.

165. The message is clear: South Africa will shrink from nothing in order to cast its sinister shadow over southern Africa. As if open aggression were not enough, it has resorted to infiltration for purposes of sabotage, spreading disorder and general insecurity in order to destabilize progressive Angola, whose accession to independence it never accepted.

166. One of the many facets of the South African ill is thus displayed before the Council for all to see. Numerous resolutions have already been adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly condemning South Africa's aggressive policies against its neighbours. Can one allow such a danger to be perpetuated without thereby acknowledging the obsolescence of the machinery set up 40 years ago to protect international peace and security? I would recall that slightly more than 40 years ago the democracies allowed fascism to spread its rot when it attacked, with full impunity, a member country of the League of Nations, Ethiopia, without any appropriate response. Then it was the turn of Czechoslovakia, Poland and other countries, but by then it was too late. A great deal of blood and tears were shed in subduing the fascist hydra.

167. We therefore fail to understand why certain members of the Security Council are so reluctant to endorse collective sanctions against a notorious troublemaker. How can one guarantee and justify the adoption in other circumstances of preventive measures, or even unilateral sanctions, as some have been doing outside the context of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations?

168. My delegation would fail to express the essence of its feelings if it did not take this opportunity to reiterate the unswerving support of the Congo for Angola in the struggle it has been obliged to wage to protect its independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty. We wish to thank the Angolan Minister for Foreign Affairs for the information and first-hand analysis he gave us in the Council on the concerns of the Angolan Government in connection with the provocative acts of South Africa.

169. I also wish to refer to the statement which the heads of State of the Congo and Angola, President Denis Sassou-Nguesso and President José Eduardo dos Santos, published a few days ago after the working visit Mr. Dos Santos made to Brazzaville, in which the two heads of State confirmed the common determination of their countries to fight colonialism, imperialism and *apartheid*, for peace in southern Africa and throughout the world.

170. It is our duty to extend this assistance to Angola. It is the duty of the Security Council to do so also. That is why we hope the Council will adopt a draft resolution at least condemning South Africa for its acts of aggression, demanding that it pay just compensation to Angola for the damage continuously inflicted upon the people of that country for the last 10 years and that it unconditionally withdraw its forces from Angolan territory, prohibiting it from ever returning there. As for the rest, we have full confidence that the Council will consider appropriate ways and means of ensuring implementation of its decisions.

171. The PRESIDENT: I shall now make a brief statement in my capacity as the representative of TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO.

172. For the 10 years of its life as an independent State, Angola has had to endure the travails of South Africa's

outright aggression, interference and intervention in its internal affairs. This persistent destabilization campaign seeks to frustrate Angola's attempts to achieve total realization of the benefits of its independence.

173. The raid by South Africa's racist military forces at Malongo, in the province of Cabinda, is but the latest in a long chain of aggressive acts and territorial intrusions by the *apartheid* régime of South Africa. It is as if South Africa were working to some evil design. It is obvious that in view of this persistent aggression Angola will have to continue relying on international support to resist the *apartheid* régime's flagrant violations of its sovereignty and territorial integrity. These unprovoked and persistent acts of aggression against Angolan territory constitute blatant and totally callous violations of international law and elementary principles of justice. In these circumstances, it is clear that the actions of the racist Pretoria régime are a threat to international peace and security and should be condemned by the Council. Any country that is a producer or refiner of petroleum understands the enormous impact on a country and on its economy of any act—and in particular a foreign incursion—leading to the destruction of its petroleum installations. Such an event would strike at the very heart of any economically weak developing country.

174. The statement of 17 May 1985 by the South African Government has led international public opinion to believe that South Africa has disengaged its military forces from Angolan territory. The capture of the South African commando, the seizure of military equipment parachuted from aircraft coming from South Africa and from the occupied Territory of Namibia, the increased violation of Angolan national airspace by South African reconnaissance flights and the concentration of South African military and logistic units along the border with Namibia all belie Pretoria's assertion and underline its deceit. It is clear that, contrary to its pronouncements, the South African régime is continuing its policy of destabilization and occupation of Angola.

175. The Council has the responsibility of ensuring respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola. The Council must therefore call for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Pretoria's military forces from the territory of Angola. The Council must also seek to persuade South Africa that the use of force does not resolve political problems, but only exacerbates them. South Africa's policies of destabilization and aggression towards Angola must be condemned unanimously by the Council. A strong signal would thereby be sent to that régime of the international community's determination not to allow one State, on the basis of a destorted, archaic and abhorrent theory of human relations—*apartheid*—to disrupt international peace and security.

176. The use of Namibia by the racist régime of South Africa as a springboard for perpetrating destabilization, armed attacks and the occupation of parts of the territory of Angola compounds South Africa's aggression. That a Territory for which the United Nations is responsible should be used in this manner by South Africa shows the insensitive nature of the racist South African imperialists.

177. The Council must act on the draft resolution before us decisively and with unanimity, so that the *apartheid* régime in South Africa will have no illusions about the determination of the Council to maintain international peace and security.

178. I now resume my function as PRESIDENT of the Council.

179. It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to vote on the draft resolution before it [*S/17286*]. Unless I hear an objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously [resolution 567 (1985)].

180. Mr. MAXEY (United Kingdom): I have not spoken up to now, first because it was the wish of the delegation of Angola and of other members of the Council that this debate should be concluded rapidly, and secondly, because I registered my Government's views on the Cabinda incident fully in my statement in the Council on 14 June [*2590th meeting*]. As I said then, the United Kingdom unequivocally condemns this violation of Angola's sovereignty and regards the involvement of South African military personnel in Cabinda as indefensible.

181. In accordance with these views, my delegation considered that the Council should express strong condemnation of South Africa's illegal and totally unjustifiable act of force in Cabinda. We have accordingly voted in favour of the resolution. In so doing, we do not endorse every formulation in the present text. We do not consider that the third preambular paragraph and paragraphs 1 and 3 fall within the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations or constitute a finding or decision which has specific consequences under the Charter. Our intention is simply to express our views in the clearest possible manner to the Government of South Africa, and our sympathy to the Government of Angola.

182. Mr. CLARK (United States of America): The United States deplores the South African action in Cabinda. We have made our deep displeasure known both in public statements and directly to the Government of South Africa. We have received no satisfactory explanation from that Government for its conduct. Naturally, we are particularly disturbed by evidence that the South African military action in Cabinda posed a threat to the lives of United States citizens in that province, and a danger to the property of United States companies there. In view of these circumstances, we want to see that such incidents, which violate the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola, do not recur.

183. The views of my Government on cross-border violence in southern Africa are well known to members of the Council and were reiterated in this chamber most recently

in our statement during the Namibia debate on 12 June [*2587th meeting*]. We deplore cross-border violence in any direction and in any form. United States diplomacy in southern Africa has been aimed at stopping violence, obtaining the removal of foreign forces and securing respect for national sovereignty and the inviolability of international borders. It is clear that any South African military activities inside Angola—including intelligence-gathering operations which South African Government spokesmen have said are continuing—run directly contrary to the goals and objectives of the United States.

184. My Government has been in the forefront of efforts to bring about a peaceful negotiated solution to the conflicts in southern Africa. It was this effort that resulted over a year ago in the signing of the Lusaka accord, which led to the progressive withdrawal of South African occupation forces from southern Angola. Despite continuing problems in the region, this agreement produced over 12 months of effective peace and practical co-operation between South African and Angolan military forces along the Namibian border. We are encouraged that South Africa has completed the disengagement process and heartened by its announcement of the withdrawal of its troops from the dams at Ruacana and Calueque. In view of this positive development, my Government does not understand, nor does it accept, the use in the resolution of the term "occupation forces" to describe any continued South African military presence in Angola.

185. In light of the progress represented in the Lusaka accord, my Government was particularly disturbed to learn of the incident in Cabinda. In our view, this incident, and other recent instances of violence in South Africa, Angola, Botswana and elsewhere in the region, underscore the importance of moving rapidly to a negotiated settlement in the region. We are committed to this goal, and we will continue to pursue it.

186. Despite our objections to the reference to South African "occupation" forces in Angola, and our objections to the implicit references to Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations contained in several paragraphs of the resolution, our strong feelings on the question of cross-border violence led us to vote in favour of this resolution.

187. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Angola has asked to speak, and I now call on him.

188. Mr. de FIGUEIREDO (Angola): The Council heard terminological inexactitudes from the very lips of the racist representative of South Africa.

189. Mr. President, allow me to express my Government's appreciation for the skilful manner in which you have handled Angola's complaint, yet another instance of South African aggression against the People's Republic of Angola. The people of Angola bear the warmest fraternal regard for the people of Trinidad and Tobago.

190. I also wish to thank all those who have once again spoken out in support of the position of the Government and the people of Angola, and all our non-aligned friends who sponsored the resolution just adopted by the Council and, indeed, all those who voted in favour.

191. The representative of the racist régime has blatantly and shamelessly obfuscated the truth and misrepresented reality. The only ideology completely foreign to the continent of Africa is that of *apartheid*, introduced into southern Africa by the minority racist régime of South Africa, perpetuated by it, constitutionalized by it, institutionalized by it. It is the *apartheid* régime which is the threat to peace and security in our region, leading it to disastrous consequences because the people of southern Africa refuse to succumb to the tyranny which has been imposed on them by the minority racist régime of South Africa.

192. The official position of the Angolan Government and its offer are contained in the letter addressed by the President of my country to the Secretary-General on 17 November 1984 [*S/16838*].

193. The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers for this meeting. The Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 7.05 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00400 90-61439—April 1994—2,050